

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00366 161523Z

45

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00

ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02

OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15

TRSE-00 NSC-05 BIB-01 USIE-00 ERDE-00 /083 W

----- 076966

O P 161340Z JUL 75

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1127

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T MBFR VIENNA 0366

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET REPS OF JULY 10, 1975

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: ON JULY 10, US REP, ACCOMPANIED BY  
US DEPREP, OSD REP AND JCS REP, HAD DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET  
REPS KHESTOV AND SMIRNOVSKY AT INVITATION OF SOVIETS.  
SOVIET MILITARY ADVISOR KAPETONOV WAS ALSO PRESENT. THE  
DISCUSSION, WHICH FOCUSED ON THE ISSUE OF FORCE DEFINITIONS,  
BROUGHT SEVERAL INTERESTING POINTS TO LIGHT BUT DID NOT  
RESULT IN ANY EASTERN MOVEMENT. IT BECAME APPARENT THAT,  
WHATEVER THE FORMULATIONS USED, THE MAIN SOVIET MOTIVE WITH  
REGARD TO DEFINITIONS AT THIS TIME WAS TO MOVE THE POLISH

AND CZECHOSLOVAK GROUND-BASED AREA AIR DEFENSE PERSONNEL TO  
THE AIR FORCE.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00366 161523Z

2. KHLESTOV MADE CLEAR FROM THE OUTSET THAT, IN THE PRACTICAL SENSE, HE HAD ONLY THREE DIFFICULTIES WITH THE PROPOSED WESTERN DEFINITION: (A) FRG PERSHING MISSILE PERSONNEL SHOULD BE ALLOCATED TO GROUND FORCES RATHER THAN TO AIR FORCES; (B) ALL PACT TERRITORIAL AIR DEFENSE, I. E., THE POLES AND CZECHOSLOVAKS, SHOULD BE ALLOCATED TO THE AIR FORCES; (C) HELICOPTER PERSONNEL AND PERSONNEL OPERATING LIGHT FIXED-WING AIRCRAFT SHOULD BE ASSIGNED TO THE GROUND FORCES.

3. KHLESTOV INDICATED HE WOULD NOT OBJECT IF, ACCORDING TO THE PRINCIPLE OF TREATING LIKE FORCES THE SAME, WHICH THE EAST PROPOUNDS, HELICOPTER PERSONNEL AND PERSONNEL CONCERNED WITH LIGHT FIXED-WING AIRCRAFT WERE ALLOCATED TO AIR FORCES. BUT HE THEN RESISTED A QUESTION WHETHER, ACCORDING TO THE EASTERN POSITION, IT WOULD NOT BE JUST AS LOGICAL TO PLACE ALL GROUND-BASED TERRITORIAL AIR DEFENSE IN THE GROUND FORCES AS IN THE AIR FORCES. THIS INDICATED A DESIRE TO PROTECT THE POINT THAT THE POLISH AND CZECHOSLOVAK GROUND-BASED AREA AIR DEFENSE PERSONNEL BE MOVED TO AIR FORCES.

4. KHLESTOV MADE REPEATED EFFORTS TO PERSUADE US REP TO AGREE EVEN IN A TENTATIVE WAY TO THESE FORCE ALLOCATIONS OR, FAILING SPECIFIC RESOLUTION OF THESE CASES, TO AGREE TO THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE THAT THE SAME TYPES OF FORCES SHOULD BE ASSIGNED TO THE SAME MAJOR FORCE CATEGORY, EITHER AIR FORCES OR GROUND FORCES. US REP FLATLY DECLINED TO ACCEPT THIS PROPOSAL. HE INDICATED IT MIGHT BE PROFITABLE TO TRY TO REACH SOME INFORMAL UNDERSTANDING AS TO THE FIRST TWO GOALS SPECIFIED BY KHLESTOV IN THE INFORMAL SESSION OF JULY 10, COMPREHENSIVENESS, AND DIVISION OF ALL FORCES IN THE AREA BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR FORCES.

5. KHLESTOV RESPONDED THAT HE WAS INTERESTED ONLY IN A PACKAGE DEAL: THAT IS, BEFORE HE WOULD AGREE TO THE FIRST TWO POINTS, HE WANTED SOME DEGREE OF AGREEMENT AS TO DISPOSITION OF THE THREE DISPUTED CATEGORIES. KHLESTOV ALSO INDICATED SOME RESISTANCE TO AGREE TO THE CONCEPT OF EXCLUDING THE FRG READINESS RESERVE FROM THE POSSIBLE DEFINITION, CLAIMING THAT THOSE PERSONNEL SHOULD BE CONSIDERED ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL. US REPS POINTED OUT THAT THIS FRG GROUP DID

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00366 161523Z

NOT EXIST AS YET AND THAT IT SHARED THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESERVES IN OTHER COUNTRIES. AT THE END OF THE DISCUSSION, KHLESTOV RETURNED TO AN UNSUCCESSFUL EFFORT TO GAIN ACCEPTANCE OF A SLIGHTLY EXPANDED VERSION OF THE SOVIET DEFINITION PRESENTED IN THE INFORMAL SESSION OF JULY 1.

6. US REPS ASKED KHLESTOV WHY THE WARSAW PACT WAS AT THIS LATE DATE URGING THAT ALL FORCES IN THE AREA BE DIVIDED INTO

GROUND AND AIR FORCES DESPITE ITS OWN CLAIMS THAT ITS FORCES WERE DIFFERENTLY ORGANIZED AND THE FACT THAT IMPLEMENTATION OF ITS OWN PROGRAM WOULD REQUIRE NO SUCH DIVISION OF ALL FORCES IN THE AREA INTO TWO FORCES. KHESTOV GAVE NO CONVINCING REPLY, BUT DID STATE THAT THE SOVIETS CONTINUED TO INSIST ON REDUCTION OF AIR FORCES.

7. IN A BRIEF DISCUSSION OF GENERAL ISSUES, KHESTOV MADE A PITCH FOR INCLUSION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN REDUCTIONS. HE SAID A WESTERN MOVE IN THIS DIRECTION WOULD BE HELPFUL FOR THE NEGOTIATIONS. END SUMMARY.  
REMAINDER OF REPORT TRANSMITTED SEPTTEL.RESOR

SECRET

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** AIR DEFENSE, DIPLOMATIC DISCUSSIONS, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 16 JUL 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** ElyME  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975MBFRV00366  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D750245-0995  
**From:** MBFR VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19750751/aaaabtwi.tel  
**Line Count:** 127  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION ACDA  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** ElyME  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 02 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <02 APR 2003 by Izenbel0>; APPROVED <15 OCT 2003 by ElyME>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
06 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET REPS OF JULY 10, 1975  
**TAGS:** PARM, US, UR, NATO, MBFR, (KHLESTOV), (SMIRNOVSKY)  
**To:** STATE DOD  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006